



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HUMAN PROGRESS: THE IDEA AND THE REALITY

VICTOR S. YARROS
Hull-House, Chicago, Illinois

I

Whatever else the great world-war has done, it is certain that in thousands of sad and thoughtful homes, the globe over, some such questions as these have been asked and pondered: Is human progress a mere illusion? If such things can be, what and where is our vaunted culture, our civilization? If the terrible and apparently needless and futile struggle is compatible with civilization, and does not reduce so-called progress to a mockery and sham, what *is* the true definition of progress? Finally, does a "progress" which renders such horrors possible, or which fails to prevent or exclude them, signify or contain anything worth while?

It is doubtless safe to say that the sad and quiet homes alluded to have not satisfactorily answered these grave questions. They are anxiously waiting for light, and expecting the philosophers and moralists to give them such light and comfort, to renew their faith or allay their painful doubts and misgivings. Some of the American and European philosophers have attempted to grapple with the questions indicated; others have apparently been too stunned and bewildered to venture on the attempt. The City Club of Chicago, conscious of this situation, conceived the admirable idea of arranging a scientific symposium on "Human Progress" for the benefit of its own members as well as the wider public. This notable event took place in June last, and was participated in by Dr. John Dewey, the eminent American educator and philosopher, Dr. Jacob P. Hollander, political economist, and Professor James Harvey Robinson, of Columbia University, historian.

II

In this paper the views and conclusions of these thinkers, and of some others, will be summarized and considered. To facilitate

a better understanding of them, however, there is a preliminary question of importance and historical interest that invites attention—the question as to the evolution and genesis of the very idea or conception of human progress.

To many educated but “general” readers it will be a distinct surprise to hear that there *is* any preliminary question concerning the idea of progress. Our own age is so familiar with this idea, and the term is so cherished a household possession, that few stop to ask anything regarding its past, its origin, and development. Yet, as Auguste Comte and other sociologists have pointed out, the idea of progress *as now understood* is not only modern, but astonishingly recent. According to Comte, it dates from Fontenelle and Condorcet. Antiquity knew nothing of the idea. The seers, innovators, emancipators, reformers of antiquity, Comte contends, merely rebelled against tradition, authority, and blind obedience. In offering the world new truths and new principles, however, these leaders and guides did not explicitly affirm any general idea of progress, and hardly so much as suspected that such an idea was implicit in their views and attitudes. To come to destroy the old and proclaim a new gospel—a revolutionary one—is not to lay down a “law of progress.” To advocate change or even improvement is not to imply that there is such a thing as progress, in the strictly modern sense of the term. To paint or sigh for a Utopia, to dream of a new heaven and earth, to believe that human nature can be suddenly modified and a social order revolutionized, is not necessarily to accept the conception of progress.

What is that conception? In the words of M. Emile Faguet, the French academician, critic, and author, to believe in progress is to admit or assert that humanity steadily, if slowly, marches toward the Better, or the Best—tends toward the Best, undergoes constant improvement.

To be sure, there are those who admit or recognize reactions or retrogressions; who believe that nations, communities, even the whole civilized world, may cease to advance and even temporarily lapse into lower, outgrown states, perhaps even into barbarism. Herbert Spencer and others were of the opinion, in the late years of the last century, that modern society was seriously

threatened with "rebarbarization." Governments, parties, labor organizations, schools of thought, single philosophers, have been accused from time to time of preaching and practicing reactionary doctrines, of seeking to undo the great work of decades or even of centuries. But there is invariably in these complaints or indictments the tacit assumption, if not the expressed conviction, that the reaction is but temporary, and that the march of humanity toward its goal will and must be resumed sooner or later.

Thus the essence of the modern conception of progress is continuity—relative, perhaps, rather than absolute, but continuity—steadiness, persistence, and certainty. The conception implies that progress is in a sense *the law of humanity*; that human beings as such tend to perfect themselves, to grow and improve in certain directions; that they are better now than they were in the past, and will be better tomorrow than they are today.

It is plain that the shock administered to us by the great and cruel war—responsibility for which every nation is so eager to disclaim—is directly attributable to this modern conception of progress. Even those of us who are prepared for lapses, for reaction and retrogression, somehow assume that any reaction must be "a little one" in this day and generation. A bad act of parliament; the repeal or emasculation of a good act; a blunder or crime on the part of a cabinet or diplomatic clique; a "sort of war" in some remote part of the world; even a war between two great but not quite civilized powers—such things we can account for and understand. They do not militate against the very idea of human progress. But this Pan-European or world-war, this tragedy of blunders, aggressions, failures, and jealousies, of suspicions and fears and alarms, we cannot, at least at this time, bring ourselves to regard as nothing more than a lapse, an exception to the rule of human life. We sorrowfully say to ourselves that if this be an "exception," the alleged rule itself would seem to be valueless and a piece of bitter irony. Some thinkers are so buried in gloom and pessimism that they are led to dispute the modern idea of progress and to hark back to the ancients. Others feel that the time for rational and sober conclusions has not come and therefore deliberately lay the whole question aside, to be taken up a decade hence, perhaps.

III

Without speculating on the probable results of future controversies, however, deep interest is felt in many circles in the views expressed today by earnest, informed, and cultivated persons concerning the nature and meaning of progress.

M. Faguet, the eminent Frenchman already quoted, in an article or critical review of a work entitled *L'Histoire de l'idée de progrès*, by Jules Delvaille, a compatriot of his, treated the subject in a fresh, candid, and thought-provoking manner. The article was contributed to the Paris magazine, *La Revue*, in April, 1913, and we may feel sure that the author, in view of the things that have happened to France—wistful, pathetic France—since that time, has not revised his somewhat depressing conclusions. M. Faguet's method of treatment is so clear and intelligent that the final pages of his paper amply deserve, and will repay, reproduction in a rather free translation. Such a translation follows:

What do I think of the theory of progress taken by itself and as it stands—the theory of continuous, or almost continuous, improvement? I think it is absurd by its very definition. To know whether anyone is advancing toward a goal, it is necessary to know whither he is going. If you see a man walking along a route toward a point *A*, and getting farther and farther away from a point *B*, you do not know whether he is progressing or retrogressing until you find out whether his objective is *A* or *B*. If you do not know that, all you can state is one thing—that he is changing his place. Hence, to know whether humanity is progressing or retrogressing, it would be necessary to know what its goal is, its true and real goal—and also whether it is or is not deceiving itself regarding that veritable goal. But we do not know which is the real goal of humanity, and consequently we do not know whether it is advancing or retrogressing; we know only that it is moving.

Only a man placed at the extreme end of humanity and in possession of full knowledge as to the ways traversed by it would be able to tell, comparing its point of departure with its point of arrival, that it has marched from improvement to improvement; or that it has advanced with numerous digressions and retrogressions; or that it has deceived itself all along. But a man living in an indeterminate epoch of history, in the sense that one does not know whether the epoch is nearer the end or the beginning of history—such a man has no illumination on this question of universal history, and lacks sense even if he puts such a question.

However, not to take things too abstractly, suppose we ask ourselves simply whether humanity is in a better state than formerly; have we not sufficient historical knowledge to answer—and to answer "Yes"? This depends on the

point of view. Is humanity greater than formerly by reason of its superior art? The adherents of the theory of progress are bent on proving this to be the case, but they are actually at their weakest in this line of demonstration. Is humanity happier? We do not know; for if there be one incontestable thing, it is that man advances in happiness, or in capacity for happiness and therefore in happiness, to the extent to which he advances in morality. But, are you quite sure of moral progress? There it is that we see waves, crises followed by formidable retrogressions. Nothing, in fact, is less certain than moral progress through the ages.

Does humanity know more? Well, humanity knows more, but man knows less. Humanity has amassed an enormous sum of knowledge, but the most learned knows but a small part of that knowledge, and every man is relatively more ignorant than he was in ancient times, when there was less to know. Man is grand, but men are small; every man is small and ignorant; this is tantamount to saying that Man knows nothing.

If we regard knowledge as an instrument or means of forming general ideas, and as a source of inexhaustible pleasure to him who knows, we still find that the most ancient of ancients had a host of general ideas that satisfied them and that we cannot see were so miserably inferior to our general ideas. As for the pleasure, the joy, of knowledge, the most ancient of ancients had enough knowledge to give each of them pleasure during the course of a long life.

But the question of happiness persists in returning. Does not science contribute to morality; and if there is more science, there must be more morality and therefore more happiness?

Does science contribute to morality? If we have in mind the science or knowledge possessed by the individual, it may be admitted that very often the educated man is more moral than the ignorant; but the truth is, the educated man is more educated just because he is more moral, and not more moral because he is more educated. There are but two classes of instructed men: those who acquire education because they wish to "arrive," because it is a means of material success, and those who educate themselves out of pure love of knowledge. The former are merely ambitious and worldly, and knowledge does not give them superior or higher morality than the morality with which they start. The others, who educate themselves, not because of their desire to prosper and succeed, not from vanity or greed, not from love of power, but out of pure, disinterested love of knowledge, these are evidently moral at the outset; they were born moral, so to speak. It is their morality that impelled them to acquire knowledge. If they had not been able to acquire knowledge they would have been peasants or workmen of that strict integrity, that high morality, that profound virtue, which sometimes astonish and humiliate us—peasants or workmen that belong to the *élite* of humanity; since it hardly needs saying that the *élite* is not restricted to any class, and that there are princes of humanity even among the illiterate and the ignorant. As for the general spread of knowledge and literacy among the masses, in France the number of crimes committed has doubled since the introduction of universal

and compulsory instruction. The connection between knowledge and morality has not been demonstrated at all and is more than doubtful.

What, then, becomes of the hypothesis of progress? Artistic progress is non-existent; scientific progress is a fact, but it is a progress that neutralizes itself in the process; moral progress, the only thing that matters, if we consider human happiness to be our true end, would exist if scientific progress had any perceptible influence on morals—but that is a proposition that has not been demonstrated.

M. Faguet concludes that the theory of continuous and uninterrupted human progress is a sheer delusion, a prejudice, not only useless, but dangerous. It is a dangerous prejudice or notion because, M. Faguet argues, it begets indifference, inaction, fatalism. It is just as bad and paralyzing as the belief that things are going from bad to worse and that no human effort is of any avail, or as the belief that, by a sort of law of compensation, things always remain the same, and that no change that takes place affects anything vital or fundamental in human nature and conduct. For if progress is assured, if it be a law of humanity, if it is automatic or spontaneous, why toil and suffer and make sacrifices?

What, then, we should believe in, and what we have evidence to support, is the modest, unsensational doctrine that in certain directions improvements and ameliorations are possible. We should, in other words, believe in certain *kinds* of progress, but not in *progress*. We have a passion for effort, a mania for invention, and this is largely the cause of our zest for life, our joy in life. "Inventionism" is not necessarily good for us; it does not necessarily make for happiness, but it seems to be a law of our being. Some of the things we regard as progressive are not progressive at all, but humanity is like a sick man who seeks relief in turning from side to side, or from side to back. The relief is temporary, but it is real relief for the time being. At any rate, if not all change is progress, some change is, and to believe in amelioration and improvement is to have a motive for effort and action.

IV

M. Faguet's views are not very cheerful, as we see. Even the admission he finally makes is made grudgingly and with reserve. Some advance, some improvement, in certain directions he declares

to be possible. This may be sufficient basis for various reform movements and liberal or radical schools or parties. But it cannot excite enthusiasm or zeal. Such a conception of progress in society and humanity may give us patient, useful workers, but it will not give us inspired and inspiring leaders, martyrs, generous and noble pioneers. Of course, if the conception in question is the best that science and experience will warrant, it is idle to complain. But *is* it the best thing we can hope for? Is M. Faguet as scientific as he is sobering and dispiriting?

Dr. John Dewey, in his contribution to the City Club symposium above mentioned, had more to offer us. He shares some of the negative views of Faguet, it seems. He believes that we have been far too shallow and complacent in our notions of progress, assuming that it is all but irrepressible and inevitable; that we have attributed human progress to Providence, or Evolution, or the Nature of Things, and have mistaken change, and especially rapidity of change, for wonderful progress. He holds that the technical, scientific, and material advances of the last one hundred and fifty years have merely provided *opportunity* for progress in the true sense of the term, instead of representing or being progress itself.

Progress, according to Dr. Dewey, is a human task and a "retail job" at that. It is by no means a foregone conclusion. It is possible, but it is only possible under certain conditions, and these conditions are not all material and technical. They include "hard wishing," constant planning and contriving, the exercise of foresight, the devising and adopting of means, laws, methods, and social arrangements. Humanity has now the technique, the method, the resources and facilities that are demanded by what we call progress, but it cannot have progress unless it deliberately goes to work to insure it. Humanity has the intelligence as well as the sentiments and emotions that are requisite to progress. While we have predatory and malevolent feelings and instincts, and while the sum total of these anti-social and selfish sentiments is great enough to keep any person, any group, any nation, any alliance of nations, in perpetual trouble, at war with others, it is equally true that we have sufficient benevolence, kindness, justice, and tenderness to give us peace and neighborliness and brotherhood, just and equitable

arrangements, if we but make proper use of this part of our endowment, our assets.

Progress, according to Dr. Dewey, is not a matter of intelligence generally, and still less is it a matter of emotion, of so-called altruism and good-will. We may have plenty of intelligence and of right feeling without being progressive or doing anything for progress. We may use our intelligence destructively or in entire indifference to progress. We may stifle or neglect our right feeling and cultivate the wrong sentiments and emotions, those that breed discord and enmity. What progress depends on, what it presupposes, is the systematic thinking and planning of progress. If we want justice, for example, we must carefully think out and enact laws designed to give us just decisions; and we must establish courts and other agencies that could be trusted rightly to interpret and enforce the laws passed in the interest of justice. If we want conciliation and arbitration, industrial or other, we must establish the proper agencies and arrangements for that end and object. If we want a certain amount of internationalism, we must establish certain useful, vital, and vigorous international agencies that will not only exemplify and further internationalism, but that will make internationalism serviceable and interesting to powerful groups of persons.

Dr. Dewey did not provide any exact definition of progress in his brilliant paper at the City Club. But, of course, it implied a clear definition throughout. By progress Dr. Dewey meant national and international peace, concord, justice, as well as social justice and equality of opportunity in every direction. His views, therefore, may be summed up thus: If we want equality of opportunity, freedom, justice, reasonable comfort for all, and intellectual and spiritual joys for all, we must do exactly what men of physical science do when they have certain problems to solve: We must think earnestly and long; we must experiment, plan, observe, compare, rearrange, restudy, experiment again, until we obtain the result desired. Progress may not be ours for the asking, but it is ours for the working. Vigorous and constant contriving and planning of progress is what will give us progress. Notoriously, the modern world has not done any such planning and contriving.

Hence the lamentable and melancholy spectacle in Europe. Hence other lamentable and discreditable spectacles—undeserved misery, widespread want in the midst of abundance, involuntary idleness of armies of men eager and able to earn a living, degradation and delinquency due to lack of vocational training and fair opportunity, and the like. If the great war has shocked us, it has also brought home to us the truth that progress must be planned and worked for, not taken for granted. Even the war is not too great a price to pay for this awakening, this discovery. Even the war, on the other hand, discouraging as it is, does not disprove the possibility, or even the certainty, of progress, provided men want it and are willing to contrive and work for it.

The difference between Dr. Dewey's view and that of Faguet is this, then—the latter expects little progress at the best, while the former leaves both the quality and the quantity of progress in our own hands, so to speak. He assigns no limits and thinks none assignable from any reasonable point of view. Dr. Dewey's message is one of hope and cheer, but also one of action and work.

It may be added here that Professors Hollander and Robinson, each from his special angle, confirmed and indorsed this message. Professor Hollander, as an economist, expressed his conviction that poverty and socially created want can be abolished, and that the means and agencies of reform are at hand. Professor Robinson, as a student of history, declared his conviction that culture and civilization are so unique and so purely human that we need draw no disheartening "biological" parallels; that we have it in our power to improve social and economic and political relations "at will," and that our failures and lapses are due to intellectual indolence, to superstition and blind reverence for tradition and authority, to erroneous notions of "human nature" and human destiny.

V

Now, while such conclusions as these are cheering and revivifying, they leave one very important question unconsidered and unanswered. We can easily imagine thinkers like Faguet putting this question as a veritable "poser" to Dr. Dewey and his adherents. It is this: If progress is "a retail job" to be successfully performed

by patient and infinite toil, by hard thinking and contriving, why should the selfish, the comfortable, the powerful, the secure, the happy, wish it hard and work for it even harder? If progress is *not* a law of humanity—if we must, as it were, bargain and contract for it—to what elements or properties of human mind and nature are we to address our demand or prayer for co-operation in the cause of progress? What inducements have we to offer them? The contractor works for profit; if we wish to contract for progress, what profit can we promise to those who are well off here and now? Shall we appeal to their sense of expediency? Shall we tell them that they would be happier and safer than they are under a régime of progress? M. Faguet would smile at a suggestion of this sort; there are hundreds of thousands who would not respond to any argument from expediency. They live in the present and care little about their grandchildren or more remote posterity; they will tell us that the existing order is certain to outlive them and those that are dear to them, and that there is no earthly reason why they should work hard for social progress, for the welfare of others. Shall we appeal to the sense of justice, of sympathy, of generosity? Shall we argue that there is great joy and satisfaction in well-doing, in service, in disinterested labor, and that the promotion and realization of progress will be its own reward? Shall we, in short, appeal to the altruistic sentiments and emotions? If so, and if we expect our appeal to be successful, what is the necessary implication? Clearly, the implication is that the altruistic sentiments are stronger than the egoistic ones, and that even the selfish, the callous, the indifferent, the beneficiaries of unjust privileges or accidental good fortune, may be aroused and stirred to action by tales or pictures of suffering, of want, of inhumanity, of avoidable degradation and degeneration. And if we admit that this is the implication of the appeal, do we not admit, in reality, that man is distinguished *by* his altruism, *by* his sentiments of justice and beneficence? And, finally, if we admit this, do we not admit that progress *is* the law of human nature? If we can have progress by appealing to altruism because altruism is stronger than egoism, then progress is a law of our being, since it is inconceivable that the appeals in behalf of progress and of altruism—and to altruism—should ever be suspended for any considerable period.

To say that the appeal is not to altruism, to the sentiment of justice and generosity, is to say that there is nothing to appeal to, for there is no third set of qualities in human nature. If enlightened self-interest or expediency is insufficient, and if altruism is also insufficient, then M. Faguet is right, and we need expect no very great advance in any direction save that of material prosperity and mechanical invention. A little social or moral improvement may, indeed, be expected as a mere by-product of such progress, but in such a by-product there is little to glorify.

The Spencerian evolutionist, it may here be pointed out, regards the question just discussed as unanswerable from the viewpoint of strict utilitarians or pure intellectualists. He holds that the only basis for a rational theory of progress is the doctrine that social development and social discipline *have* steadily strengthened and *are* steadily strengthening our sentiments of justice and beneficence; that, although altruism is as primordial as egoism, and is by no means confined to man, it is not a fixed quantity, and that human progress depends on the growth and intensification of our altruistic sentiments. He holds that what we call character and goodness are the highest and finest products of evolution, and that intelligence and knowledge are only tools and instruments used by the emotions and the will of humanity. If the Spencerian evolutionist is right, progress may be said to be a law of our being, albeit education and environmental influences are extremely important.

But if we deny that altruism is and has long been increasing, and if we assert that there is no more evidence of any increase in innate altruism in a hundred thousand years than there is of an increase in the mental power and capacity of man in the last six or seven thousand years, then the burden of proof falls on us and we must demonstrate by reference to history and to contemporary experience that, weak and frail as we are, divided against ourselves as we are, sadly deficient as we are in qualities we deem admirable, the amount of right thinking and right feeling in us is, and long has been, quite sufficient to assure progress if we but take the necessary pains with it and deliberately make it our object and goal. Can we sustain this burden of proof? Is the proposition demonstrable? *Can* it be shown that "we have as much progress as we deserve"; that we have always had as much progress as we "bargained for,"

worked for, sought, in a "retail way," to achieve and nail down, as it were?

Let us see to what lame and impotent conclusion a great naturalist and biologist—Alfred Russel Wallace—was finally brought by his disbelief in the inheritance of acquired traits, his assertion that natural selection and sexual selection are the only actual factors of evolution.

Wallace, as his last books show, believed that "our whole system of society is rotten from top to bottom," and that "the social environment as a whole, in relation to our possibilities and our claims, is the worst that the world has ever known." He ascribed the rottenness of modern society to the competitive régime and to the failure of governments to substitute co-operation for competition. He also recognized the fact that the so-called competitive régime is only competitive in part; that many monopolies and special privileges enjoyed by the few render the field far from free or fair, and that equality of opportunity is the first condition of really legitimate and fair competition. His remedy for our ills may be stated in one word, "co-operation." By co-operation he meant "economic brotherhood," industrial democracy, freedom of access to land and capital by all, under capable direction.

Of course, Wallace could not and did not ignore the question which such views inevitably suggest—how, if society is appallingly rotten and things are going from bad to worse, we can expect to change our immoral environment into a moral one and to initiate an era of sound and healthy progress. That is, to whom and to what are those of us who are dissatisfied and restive to appeal in the name of progress?

Wallace's answer, however, was so strangely and singularly superficial and unscientific that it has puzzled many of his admirers. It amounts to this—that, in the first place, "the more intelligent of the workers" are now prepared to attack the root-causes of our social and economic ills and to demand the appropriate remedies, and that, in the second place, the creation of a new and moral environment *through* co-operation and social justice will release certain purely natural and biological forces, now dormant, that make for human improvement and progress—the forces, namely,

of sexual selection. Today woman is not free to choose; the emancipated and independent woman of the co-operative order will refuse to marry the ugly, the mean, the brutal, and the anti-social man, and her rejection of the unfit will gradually lead to the selection and further improvement of the morally fit.

It is not in the least necessary to discuss the claims and hopes based by Wallace on sexual selection, for he tells us himself that this factor is inoperative at present and will come into play only *after* the creation of a new and moral environment. Woman, when free, will do this or that; but only a co-operative and just régime will free woman, and our problem is how to abolish the present régime and usher in the new one. Here sexual selection will not help us, and we are left with nothing save the fact that, in the words of Wallace, "the more intelligent of the workers" realize the evils of monopoly and wage-slavery, and are ready, or almost ready, to fight resolutely for equality of opportunity and co-operation.

Verily, the mountain has labored and has brought forth a mouse! That *some* intelligent workers favor co-operation is true and of good augury; but if all our hope of reform and progress rests on that fact, and that fact alone, the social and economic outlook is dismal indeed. How long will it take to convert the millions of the "less intelligent workers"? And are we sure that the conversion of even a decided majority of the workers would suffice? Are we reduced to the class struggle and the class consciousness again, and after all? And what would Wallace have said about the collapse of the class struggle and of international socialism in Europe as a feature of the great war?

The truth is that those who deny that the altruistic sentiments are developing and growing stronger as the result of social discipline and adaptation to the social state, those who base their hopes of progress on intelligence alone, are left with broken reeds to lean on after an analysis of the whole situation and the various factors involved.

Fortunately, not all thinkers reject the theory of the transmission of acquired psychological traits, of the inheritance of the effects of education, culture, and social discipline; not all thinkers reject the doctrine of the continued adaptability of mankind and the

growth of the altruistic sentiments. The belief in human progress rests on something more than class interest, on something more than the ideas of "the more intelligent workers," on something more than the existence of scientific method and technique, on something more than the possibility of more systematic planning and contriving of certain desiderata in social, economic, and political arrangements. All these are factors, no doubt, but the greatest factor is the growing sentiment of justice. Progress is a resultant of several forces.

Illustrations of this truth abound. Slavery was not abolished in the United States by any single set of influences. Self-interest, reason, emotion, military necessity—all these conspired to bring about the step—certainly a progressive step. Industrial co-operation is progress, but it is clear that it will not displace the wage-system and capitalism solely because of the "intelligence of some of the workmen." Prison reform, the abolition of the capital penalty, and like improvements are slowly being realized largely by reason of successful appeals to and stimulation of the altruistic sentiments. On the other hand, for some proposed reforms we say that "the time is not ripe," or the average human being "is not ready." We imply that at some future time the average human being will be prepared to accept the now "utopian" proposal. We expect that events, experience, and propaganda will educate him—educate him not intellectually alone, but emotionally as well. If, however, we can purify and refine human emotion, do we not thereby facilitate progress, render it less difficult for the future?

Progress is not automatic, to be sure. Changes are effected in time, not by time, as Morley said long ago. If humanity went to sleep for a century there would be no progress. Progress, as Dr. Dewey holds, is a retail job, to be bargained for and carefully planned. But if we are to enlist the hosts of the indifferent and the prosperous, the doubting and the hostile; if we are to treat progress as a human and not as a class problem and task, our appeal must be increasingly to the best qualities of our evolving and improving human nature.

The war has been a bitter dose to swallow. We must revise a good many particular opinions, but we shall find ere long that even

the terrible war has not seriously shaken the profound belief in progress. For are not thoughtful men and women already saying that the war itself may become a potent instrument of progress? Are we not already planning better peace and arbitration machinery, greater publicity for and democratic control of diplomacy, and other safeguards and preventives of war? Out of evil good may come—nay *must* come. Human nature, derided and condemned by many, will attend to that operation.